



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/918,902	07/31/2001	Daniel Baker	00EC055/79183	2341

7590 05/07/2004

Welsh & Katz, Ltd.
Indira Saladi
22nd Floor
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2642

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/918,902

Applicant(s)

BAKER ET AL.

Examiner

Rasha S AL-Aubaidi

Art Unit

2642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2, 01/23/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Busey et al (US PAT # 6,665,395).

Regarding claim 1, Busey teaches a method for distributing customer contacts to a transaction processing entity of a transaction processing system (this basically reads on distributing customers calls and questions to agents in system 10 of the call center 22, see summary of the invention, col.4, lines 44-49, and col.5, lines 15-25), such method comprising: determining a media type for a customer contact in the transaction processing system; finding a transaction processing entity that is capable of handling the media type; and routing the customer contact to a transaction processing entity that is capable of handling the media type (the claimed limitations of “determining a media type, finding a transaction processing entity that is capable of handling the media type, and routing the customer contact to a transaction processing entity that is capable of handling the media type” read all together on control 14, along with other processes and devices , which perform the function of these limitations in the call center, see col.12,

Art Unit: 2642

lines 26-30, col. 4, lines 65-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5. Also, for further explanations on these limitations see the summary of the invention in Busey.

Claims 13, 21-22, 32 and 34 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 7.

Regarding claims 2, 16 and 23, the claimed "determining a media type further comprises determining a source of the customer contact" basically reads on handling this call or addressing customer request based on type of the call or the origination of the call (chat, e-mail, voice, etc). See col.8, lines 6-9.

Regarding claims 3, 17, 24 and 35-36, Busey teaches the source is an access channel comprising at least one of a telephone, Internet, radio, cellular, satellite, cable, facsimile, email, web and video (see col. 8, lines 48-52, col.12, lines 13-25, and col.3, lines 9-15).

Regarding claims 4 and 25, Busey teaches the media type further comprises a priority level specifying the order in which the customer contacts are to be processed by the transaction processing entity (see col.3, lines 17-23).

Regarding claims 5 and 26, Busey teaches the media type further comprises a parameter to specify exclusivity (see col.12, lines 31-42). This also reads on the

Art Unit: 2642

requirement of paying full attention to customers with high priority such as gold or platinum members, see col. 27, lines 38-40.

Regarding claims 6, 18, 27 and 37, Busey teaches the transaction processing entity comprises at least one of an agent (24 in Fig. 1A), an agent station (reads on computer 28 or telephone 26 in Fig. 1), a console, a terminal, and an interactive voice response unit (the use of an IVR is inherent feature in ACDs. However, Busey teaches the use of IVR, except this element is not shown, but the use of it was presented in the disclosure, see col. 27, lines 12-44).

Regarding claims 7 and 28, Busey teaches finding a transaction processing entity (reads on the agent at the agent station, see Fig.1) further comprises: finding a transaction processing entity that is not handling an exclusive media type (this may read on availability of agent, see col.8, lines 6-9 and/or the priority of task the agent is handling at the current time, see col.3, lines 55-60); determining a metric of how many customer contacts of the media type have been assigned to the transaction processing entity (basically reads on "endpoint" , see col.11, lines 15-67); and comparing the metric to a threshold relating to the maximum number of customer contacts of the media type that the transaction processing entity may handle (see col.11, lines 53-67), and when the metric exceeds the threshold, preferentially routing customer contacts to another transaction processing entity (see col. 12, lines 1-6).

Art Unit: 2642

Regarding claims 8 and 29, Busey teaches finding a transaction processing entity further comprises searching a transaction routing table for a transaction processing entity that is processing a nonexclusive media type. This reads on the system searching for the idle agent to handle the next call (see col.11, lines 33-35) or normally the agent who is not handling a high priority call or customer that requires full attention).

Regarding claims 9, 19, 30 and 39, Busey teaches using a transaction routing table to list assigned customer contacts to transaction processing entities (this basically reads on keeping a tack and recording the data and other information about customers calls and the agents that are assigned to handle these calls, see col.3, lines 32-47).

Claims 10, 20 and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 9. In addition, the feature of "routing table is updated once a customer contact has been routed to the transaction processing entity" is inherent. Busey teaches a table that keeps track of all agents' activities and performance (see for example, table I on col.15-16), therefore, when an agent will be assigned form serving an email to serving a phone call normally his/her status will be changed and updated in the database as well.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 12, 33 and 38, Busey teaches the connecting is performed by a matrix switch of an automatic call distributor (the matrix switch reads on 122 controller, see Fig. 1C and col. 5, lines 62-63).

Regarding claim 14, Busey teaches the capable transaction processing entity (agent) comprises an agent station that is equipped with the necessary hardware to handle the media type (the hardware reads on computers 28 and telephones 26, see Fig. 1A).

Regarding claim 15, Busey teaches the necessary hardware comprises interfaces to an Internet, cable television, radio, satellite, and a telephone system (this reads on interface 144, see Fig. 1C and 244, col.6, lines 9-20 and Fig. 2C).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (703) 605-5145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.


Art Unit: 2642

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Examiner

Rasha S Al-Aubaidi

04/22/2004


AHMAD MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600